

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 4 as including a typographical error, rejected claims 2 and 6 under the second paragraph of section 112, rejected claims 1 and 5 as anticipated by Prashant et al. (publication of Prashant Jain and Douglas Schmidt, more commonly referenced as Jain et al.), rejected claim 2 as obvious over Prashant et al. in view of Ford et al., rejected claim 3 as obvious over Prashant et al. in view of Gamma et al., rejected claim 4 as obvious over Prashant et al. in view of Schmidt, and rejected claim 6 as obvious over Prashant et al. in view of Goldsmith et al.

Claim Objection

The typographical error has been corrected in claim 4. Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful review of the application.

35 USC §112, 2ND ¶

The changes proposed by the Examiner have been entered into the claims. The rejections are thereby overcome.

35 USC §102

Contrary to what is taught in each of the prior art references cited in the action, the present application does not related to communications.

The present application does not relate to a connector between two frameworks, but instead relates to a framework interaction. For example, see Fig. 5 of the drawings which shows an MFC-ACE Framework Interaction.

In the present application, for example, in the upper part of Fig. 5 is seen UI-Logic and in the lower part Business-Logic. Prashant et al. (Jain et al.) does not teach UI-Logic and Business-Logic.

The Prashant et al. (Jain et al.) reference teaches to establish and maintain connections with one or more time servers (see page 8, left column, first paragraph, where connections are made to the Clerk component in a distributed time service). The Prashant (Jain) reference does not teach "a framework connector providing communications between components",

contrary to the assertions of the Examiner. See the language of claim 1 which call for this feature and thus distinguishes over the cited reference.

As to claim 5, Prashant et al. does not teach a generic main as an FW connector , as provided in the present application and as shown in Figs. 5 and 7 (see point 4 of Amendment A).

35 USC §103

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, Prashant et al. (Jain) doesn't teach an ACE as disclosed by the present application (see page 7, left column, lines 8 to 10 of the reference).

The Examiner acknowledges that the Prashant reference fails to disclose features shown in the present application. For example, Fig. 1 shows the interaction between the independent Service Dispatcher and Service Manager as Framework Connector.

Regarding the cited Ford reference, Ford teaches a Router Layer (only Services) and no Framework Interaction, as in the present application. As such, the combination of references is not shown or taught in the present application.

The remaining cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the invention and disclosed and claimed in the present application. As such, the invention is non-obvious over the art.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,



Melvin A. Robinson (Reg. No. 31,870)

Schiff Hardin LLP

Patent Department

6600 Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: 312-258-5785

CUSTOMER NO. 26574

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on August 28, 2006.

CHI\ 4670142.1